

# Lichfield Diocesan Advisory Committee

## MINUTES

*In relation to the [Health Protection \(Coronavirus, Restrictions\) \(Steps etc.\) \(England\) \(Revocation and Amendment\) Regulations 2021](#), which came into effect on 19th July 2021, a meeting of the Lichfield DAC was held remotely (by written electronic means and online conferencing) on Wednesday, 21st July 2021 at 2.00 pm*

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Opening prayers were said by the Ven. Sue Weller.
- 1.2 Present: The Revd Preb Pat Hawkins (DAC Chair), the Ven. Paul Thomas, the Ven. Sue Weller, Sarah Butler, Andy Foster, the Revd Neil Hibbins, Claire Hines, Adrian Mathias, Brough Skingley, Andy Wigley, Peter Woollam.  
In attendance: Jonathan Ansell (DAC Clock Adviser), Robin Hutchinson (DAC Clock Adviser [outgoing]), Hugh Peate (DAC Heating Adviser), Giles Standing (DAC Secretary), Helen Cook (Assistant DAC Secretary), Philip Collins (Diocesan Registry Assistant), Pauline Hollington (Diocesan Registry Assistant).
- 1.3 Apologies for absence: The Revd Preb Terry Bloor (Acting Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent), the Ven. Julian Francis, Nigel de Gaunt-Allcoat, the Revd Nick Heron, David Litchfield, Bryan Martin, Mark Parsons, Andy Smith, Julie Taylor.
- 1.4 Declarations of interest: Sarah Butler, item 4.1.1; Adrian Mathias, items 4.2.1, 4.4.2.
- 1.5 The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted without amendment.

### 2. Matters Arising

#### 2.1 Church of England guidance on church buildings and lifting of legal restrictions relating to Coronavirus (COVID-19) (19th July 2021)

The DAC Secretary indicated that the Church of England [guidance](#) relating to Coronavirus (COVID-19) and church buildings had been updated and streamlined in light of the lifting of legal restrictions on 19th July 2021. Specifically, a guidance note on [Opening and managing church buildings in step 4 of the roadmap out of lockdown](#) has been published. The DAC Chair commented that the operation of churches within the diocese, and therefore interaction with and by the DAC, may be subject to individual requirements and local situations. The Committee separately resolved that the submission of a completed diocesan COVID-19 [risk assessment](#) for DAC and adviser site visits should become voluntary (self-managed) rather than compulsory (see also item 9.1 below).

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to update the diocesan COVID-19 [policy and procedure](#) for site visits accordingly

#### 2.2 Publication of church buildings strategic review and toolkit at Diocesan Synod as part of Shaping for Mission diocesan programme (28th July 2021)

At the 9th December 2020 DAC meeting (New Matters, item 3.2), Andy Mason (Director of Glebe and Church Buildings Strategy, former Director of Property) introduced a new diocesan plan for a church buildings strategy, which would constitute a proactive (rather than reactive) approach to church buildings and link directly with the diocesan [Shaping for Mission](#) process. At that meeting (New Matters, item 3.1), Dr Lindsey Hall (Discipleship,

Vocations and Evangelism Strategy Enabler) introduced Shaping for Mission as a new and far-reaching diocesan programme of change.

At the present meeting, the DAC Secretary indicated that a detailed diocesan strategic review of church buildings had been undertaken, including the appraisal of the latest QI report for each of the 550-plus churches in the diocese, and that a resultant modular toolkit for parishes had been prepared by the review group (including the DAC Secretary). The new resource, [Buildings for Mission: a Strategic Toolkit](#), is to be presented at Diocesan Synod on 28th July 2021, and thereafter published on the diocesan website. It is anticipated that the Archdeacons, and DAC, may have an important role in the proposed model of an early intervention protocol and holistic support for parishes.

### 3. New Matters

None this meeting

### 4. Casework for Consideration

#### 4.1 Reorderings and New Facilities

##### a) Informal Advice (*before external formal consultation, if applicable*)

Grade I

##### 4.1.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-063282</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620548	Church Name:	Tong: St Bartholomew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Tong
Applicant Name:	Revd Pippa Thorneycroft	Quin. Inspector:	Tim Ratcliffe
Listing:	Grade I	Date of Last QI:	01-Aug-2012
Proposal:	Provision of toilet facilities and a tea point		
No. of times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	Not stated
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade I listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently identified or justified, and that the Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).
3. The Committee noted that the submission centres on an external extension to the historic footprint of the church to house the toilet, with the tea point proposed internally in the north aisle adjacent to the north door. No internal options are now presented.

4. It was recognised that the Chancellor had previously issued a [judgment](#) (December 2019) relating to the internal reordering of the nave north aisle, following objection on public notice to the then proposed toilet location at the west end of the church (i.e. not part of the north aisle petition).
5. The church is largely unaltered as an intact 15th-century collegiate church. Any extension will be controversial and approvals difficult to obtain. All areas proposed give some cause for concern (as below), and further information will be required to develop any scheme.
6. Option 1 (infill between porch and Golden Chapel) may prove technically difficult due to adjoining stonework and windows. It is perhaps the most recessive of the four sites presented, but is a significant visual alteration to the principal elevation of the church. It will also have a significant physical effect on the historic fabric of the building.
7. The submitted comparative Donald Insall Associates option (west of south porch) and Option 2 (west end porch) are located in relation to a highly visible part of the church and will be visible from the main road. It is a significant visual alteration to the church, and will have a significant physical effect on the historic fabric of the building.
8. Option 3 (access through north doorway) is highly visible from the main road into the village due to the raised position of the church. Again, it is a significant visual alteration to the church, and will have a significant physical effect on the historic fabric of the building.
9. The DAC Archaeology Adviser commented that any extension to this church will have a significant archaeological impact, and a desk-based assessment and possibly field evaluation (dependant on location) would be required. Option 3 would obscure significant visible archaeological damage to the church from the Civil War.
10. The DAC member nominated by the Local Government Association commented that any extension will prove very difficult to argue both for faculty and also planning approval. The church will need to provide a coherent argument as to why their preferred position is preferable to any other location (i.e. to demonstrate that there is no less harmful place for the proposed facilities), including the interior of the church.
11. The Committee resolved that a summary document of the various options and discussions (including those previously held with the DAC) is needed to enable meaningful advice. External alterations will present a significant planning challenge, which process will want to ensure that no other option is more suitable.
12. Previous discussions with the DAC have centred on a discreetly-detailed insertion at the north-west corner of the church. This would remain preferable at this stage and would not require planning approval.

It was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. Following which, external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), and the Church Buildings Council.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Grade II*

#### 4.1.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-057775</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620471	Church Name:	Church Aston: St Andrew
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Church Aston
Applicant Name:	Revd Zoe Heming	Quin. Inspector:	Anne Netherwood
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2017
Proposal:	Reordering nave north aisle to introduce toilet and cupboard tea point		
No. of times to DAC:	Third (in this form)	Cost Est:	£30,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC previously considered the proposal in a different form (application ref. 2019-035523, under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, since abandoned) as an application for informal advice at the 11th December 2019 DAC meeting. The DAC last considered the proposal in its current form as an application for informal advice at the 16th June 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC continued to support the principle of the proposal, to site the proposed toilet and tea point at the west end of the nave north aisle, and considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had been sufficiently identified and justified.
2. The revised scheme has addressed the matters previously raised by the DAC informal advice, in relation to the construction information for the tea point and toilet, and including the amending of the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).
3. However, the DAC Lighting and Electrical Adviser indicated that the outstanding issue is that a specification for the new radiator should be provided, as the revised M&E drawings (nos 1806 A103 Rev D and 1806 A305 Rev A) only cover the electrical and lighting matters.

It was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal consultation with Historic England, the Victorian Society, and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), prior to the receipt of formal DAC advice.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

#### 4.1.3

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055875</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620216	Church Name:	Willenhall: St Giles
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Giles Willenhall
Applicant Name:	Revd Susan Boyce	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [ret'd]
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	01-Mar-2017

Proposal:	To develop back of church and improve the heating		
No. of times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£350,000
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC affirmed that the stated needs for a proposal should carefully balance the proposed impact on the historic fabric of a significant church building – in this case Grade II listed – and specifically the visual impact, and impact on fabric, of such an installation.
2. It was considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had not been sufficiently identified or justified, and that the Statements of Significance and Needs should be developed accordingly. It was recommended that the parish should consult the Church of England guidance on [reorderings](#) and [Statements](#).
3. The need for the reordering was acknowledged, and it is positive that the church is so active and central to the community. The Statement of Significance does include in Section 3.1 a review of impact, but this is in isolation.
4. To begin to understand the context and impact it is necessary to compare the part plan sketch proposals against the existing arrangement of the church. An existing full floor plan (sketch at this stage is satisfactory) and a proposed full floor plan, together with the more detailed part plans, are required. It was noted that there is a font to be relocated, west seating to be integrated, an existing kitchen already in the church etc. – these need to be identified on both existing and proposed.
5. A good selection of photographs is required to show all aspects of the church interior as a whole, and the area to be reordered in more detail, and these should be submitted.
6. Without the above it is difficult to ascertain the scale of the church, and particularly the cross section and the impact of:
  - A fully glazed wall on the internal space and architectural features, such as the four clustered shaft columns with foliated capitals and the king post trusses. The glass screen is to abut the arcade columns – how will this be achieved in a sensitive way?
  - How will the proposed mezzanine floor level relate to architectural features, such as windows etc.?
7. It was noted that pews are to be removed. What are these like, and what significance have they in the context of the church and the proposals?
8. It was identified that the font and canopy are to be relocated and separated (font to outside and canopy as a feature in the church). What is each element like, and what significance have they in the context of the church and the proposals?
9. The Committee resolved that this proposal is at the concept stage, and that it may be too early for technical detail. However, in addition to that already noted, early consideration should be given to the acoustic and non-reflective quality of the glass wall, with regard to aesthetic, functionality and cost; the sensitive integration of proposed services; and whether sufficient storage has been provided to meet the anticipated flexible uses of the proposed spaces.
10. The DAC member nominated by the Local Government Association commented that the scheme must not appear too domestic in nature.

11. Separately, the DAC Bell Adviser noted that access at the west end would be required for bell works such as hoisting.
12. A DAC Heating Adviser noted the proposed installation of a new heating system, intended to be more efficient and improved environmentally, to allow for heating to be zoned and for areas of the church to be heated independently. The Adviser could give advice to the parish on this aspect of the wider proposal.

It was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that a DAC site visit should be undertaken, to meet with parish representatives and the QI architect at the church, and that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice. Following which, external informal consultation (pre-application advice) should also be undertaken with Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB).

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant; the Assistant DAC Secretary to co-ordinate a DAC site visit (see items 7.1 and 9.1 below)

**b) Formal Advice**

None this meeting

**4.2 Fabric Repairs and Alterations**

**a) Informal Advice**

None this meeting

**b) Formal Advice** *(after external formal consultation, if applicable)*

Grade II\*

4.2.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-060468</a>	Case Status:	Application in formal consultation
Church Code:	620429	Church Name:	Barton-under-Needwood: St James
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Barton Under Needwood
Applicant Name:	Martin Rogers	Quin. Inspector:	Adrian Mathias
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	09-Nov-2016
Proposal:	Glass doors in the vestibule of the west entrance to the church		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£8,000
Formal Consultations:	Historic England; SPAB; Victorian Society		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 5th May 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the

church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the Committee’s informal advice. The DAC also carefully appraised the external consultation responses, and noted that no formal objections had been raised for consideration in the DAC’s own formal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal.

**Decision:** Recommend

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

*Grade II*

#### 4.2.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-062997</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620354	Church Name:	Shelton: St Mark
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	The Holy Evangelists, Hanley
Applicant Name:	Rev Phillip Jones	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [project architect: Edward Kepczyk, Buttress]
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	12-Aug-2014
Proposal:	Nave roof re-covering and insulation, ceiling repairs in aisles, and masonry repairs to tower		
No. of times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£995,878
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs. The Committee noted that the proposal had been formulated under a current Development Stage grant from the National Lottery Heritage Fund, and that the parish is to apply for a second, Delivery Stage, grant in August 2021, with a decision in November 2021, by which date a faculty must be in place.

It was determined that the proposal, including the roof insulation, would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable, and that the application should advance to the giving of DAC formal advice accordingly.

**Decision:** Recommend

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

### 4.3 Services and M&E

#### a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

## b) Formal Advice

None this meeting

## 4.4 Furniture and Fittings

### a) Informal Advice *(before external formal consultation, if applicable)*

Grade II\*

#### 4.4.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055590</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620122	Church Name:	Pattingham: St Chad
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Pattingham and Patshull
Applicant Name:	David Challinor	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	17-Nov-2016
Proposal:	Levelling of floor and installation of storage cupboards		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third	Cost Est:	£7,000 [donor to cover costs]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 24th March 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the revised proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, and offered the following advice:

1. The DAC continued to support the principle of the proposal, and considered that the impact of the proposed works (i.e. potential harm to significance) had been sufficiently identified and justified.
2. It had previously been indicated that the only remaining issue related to the new floor tiling, with respect to matching the existing tiling.
3. The Committee commented that the submitted photographs of the proposed tiles show what appears to be a very good match indeed.
4. In relation to the possibility of there being insufficient reclaimed tiles to be laid under the cupboard, it was concurred that the cupboard might instead sit over a new screed, but which should be compatible with the lime mortar screed currently specified (on drawing 1896-24-01C).
5. Whilst new quarry tiles could be procured to make up any shortfall in the number of reclaimed tiles to be positioned in front of the cupboard, the Committee accepted that it would be appropriate to use tiles from the currently tiled area that will be covered by the cupboard (i.e. also to be replaced by the new screed).
6. The parish should procure a revised drawing from the QI architect accordingly.



The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal consultation with Historic England, the Victorian Society, and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), prior to the receipt of formal DAC advice.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Unlisted*

#### 4.4.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-051001</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620430	Church Name:	Branston: St Saviour
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Branston and Burton All Saints with Christ Church
Applicant Name:	David Collier	Quin. Inspector:	Brownhill Hayward Brown
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	01-Aug-2010
Proposal:	Painting of infill panels on pulpit with biblical scenes		
No. of times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£700
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, and offered the following advice:

1. The Committee supported the principle of the proposal to paint the infill panels on the pulpit.
2. The DAC member nominated by the National Amenity Societies commented that the pulpit is a modest but fitting piece of the late 19th, or more likely the early 20th, century.
3. The view was expressed that the infill panels are basic and unattractive, and painting them can only add to the appearance of the pulpit. The panels appear to be a recent addition to the pulpit in an inferior material (likely MDF) and are easily removeable.
4. The DAC clergy member nominated by Diocesan Synod commented that the proposed paintings are conventional representations of scriptural scenes.
5. However, as watercolour sketches, the designs are a little indistinct, and it would be helpful to see an example executed in acrylics, as indicated in the information supplied by the parish.
6. It was recommended that a photo of one of the panels complete (painted) should be submitted, to illustrate the effect on the pulpit and the church.
7. The Committee resolved that the PCC should accordingly approve one such sample next, at real size.

It was determined that as the proposal did not affect a building of special architectural or historic interest, external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

**b) Formal Advice** (*after external formal consultation, if applicable*)

## Unlisted

### 4.4.3

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-058955</a>	Case Status:	Notification of Advice
Church Code:	620613	Building Name:	Whitchurch Road Cemetery Chapel
Archdeaconry:	Salop	Parish:	Wem
Applicant Name:	Revd Nick Heron	Quin. Inspector:	Not stated
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	Not stated
Proposal:	Conservation of 15 loom-woven rushwork panels in the unlisted chapel in Whitchurch Road Cemetery		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£6,402
Formal Consultations:	Church Buildings Council		
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 5th May 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee supported the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be likely to affect the conservation of an article of special historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, such that external formal consultation with the Church Buildings Council (CBC), in accordance with rule 4.6(2)(a) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019, was applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the consultation response received from the CBC, and noted that the CBC was in support of the proposal and that no formal objection had been raised for consideration in the DAC's own formal advice. As such, the Committee determined to recommend the proposal with provisos.

**Decision:** Recommend with the following provisos:

- The conservator may wish to consider encasing the rushwork within fine netting (as for the conservation of banners and other textiles), which might offer further protection. A robust covering such as glass or Perspex would offer the best protection from impact, but the Church Buildings Council (as consulted) and the DAC acknowledge that within the chapel environment, it would be likely to cause problems by trapping moisture.
- It may be helpful to set the framed panels away from the wall slightly so that there is an air gap behind them; equally, it is important to keep the benches away from the panels to avoid damage or abrasion by visitors to the chapel.

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

## 4.5 Memorials, ABCRs and Churchyards

### a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

### b) Formal Advice

None this meeting

## 4.6 Landscaping

### a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

### b) Formal Advice *(after external formal consultation, if applicable)*

*Unlisted*

#### 4.6.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-061931</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620214	Church Name:	Short Heath: Holy Trinity
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	Holy Trinity Willenhall
Applicant Name:	Revd Helen Duckett	Quin. Inspector:	Francis Turner
Listing:	Unlisted	Date of Last QI:	25-Sep-2015
Proposal:	Create graded access to the north entrance of the church		
No. of Times to DAC:	Second	Cost Est:	£11,500
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 16th June 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme. At that meeting, it was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the archaeological importance of any building or of remains within the curtilage, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 was not applicable.

At the present meeting, the DAC carefully considered the resubmitted proposal and the supporting documents, and confirmed that the parish had addressed the matters previously raised by the Committee's informal advice. As such, the Committee determined that the application should advance to the giving of DAC formal advice accordingly.

**Decision:** Recommend with the following proviso:

- The works must be carried out in accordance with the clarifying details in the email from Francis Turner, QI architect, to the DAC Secretary dated 26th June 2021 (constituting a supporting document within the application).

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to issue the Notification of Advice to the applicant

## 4.7 Bells, Clocks and Organs

### a) Informal Advice

None this meeting

### b) Formal Advice *(after external formal consultation, if applicable)*

*Grade II\**

#### 4.7.1

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2021-062088</a>	Case Status:	Pre-formal consultation review
Church Code:	620247	Church Name:	Alton: St Peter
Archdeaconry:	Stoke-upon-Trent	Parish:	Alton with Bradley le Moors
Applicant Name:	Alan Walters	Quin. Inspector:	Andrew Capper [Simon Smith]
Listing:	Grade II*	Date of Last QI:	05-May-2017
Proposal:	Automatic winding on the clock and refurbishment of the dials		
No. of times to DAC:	First	Cost Est:	£11,365
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019		

The DAC carefully considered the proposal and the supporting documents, including the Statements of Significance and Needs, in relation to a site visit report by the (outgoing) DAC Clock Adviser following a visit on 25th June 2021, approved with minor amendments at the present meeting (item 7.3.2 below).

The Committee supported the principle of the proposal, and noted that the PCC had resolved to accept the report and quotation from the Cumbria Clock Company. However, the Committee recommended that the parish should also seek the view of its QI architect on the type of paint to be used for the proposed cleaning down and repainting of the tower stonework behind the dials (specified as blue gloss in the submitted quote). It was commented that the current underlayer of paint is not a good base for repainting, and that any such repainting should be undertaken in a breathable mineral paint, to prevent the stonework from deteriorating. The parish should also give consideration to consulting the Cumbria Clock Company on the possibility of the alternative installation of a copper or brass infill/back to the dials, to prevent any further requirement to paint the tower stonework.

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable. As such, the Committee suggested that the updated scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for formal DAC advice.

**Decision:** Defer

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

*Grade II*

#### 4.7.2

Case Reference No.:	<a href="#">2020-055283</a>	Case Status:	Application in formal consultation
Church Code:	620157	Church Name:	Walsall: St Gabriel, Fullbrook
Archdeaconry:	Walsall	Parish:	St Gabriel, Fullbrook, Walsall
Applicant Name:	Revd Preb Mark McIntyre	Quin. Inspector:	Graeme Renton
Listing:	Grade II	Date of Last QI:	22-Mar-2018
Proposal:	Replacement of failing pipe organ with digital hybrid organ		
No. of Times to DAC:	Third	Cost Est:	£33,000

Formal Consultations:	Church Buildings Council [under rule 4.6(3) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019]
Legislation Applies:	Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019

The DAC last considered the proposal as an application for informal advice at the 5th May 2021 DAC meeting, when the Committee offered advice on the development of the scheme, following a site visit report by the DAC Organ Adviser, approved by the DAC at its meeting on 14th October 2020.

At the 5th May 2021 meeting, the DAC carefully considered the parish response to the DAC advice, but determined to defer the giving of informal advice in view of a comprehensive written appraisal of the application by the DAC Organ Adviser, endorsed by the Committee, which would be sent to the parish prior to wider DAC consideration of the proposal. The Committee suggested that the revised scheme, when further developed, should be resubmitted for additional informal DAC advice.

At the present meeting, the Committee noted that the PCC had resolved unanimously to resubmit the revised proposal, specification, and quotation for formal (rather than informal) DAC advice and thereafter to petition the Chancellor for the installation of a hybrid organ from Cotswold Hybrid Organs. The DAC Organ Adviser commented (in absentia) that in relation to the revised proposal, a pipe or digital organ, rather than a hybrid instrument, was still to be recommended. The Archdeacon of Walsall (in absentia) registered his own support for the parish having a hybrid organ, commenting that the parish is limited in what it can afford (hybrid or pure digital) and is not in a position to countenance a major refurbishment of pipework.

It was determined that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the character of the church as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such that external formal consultation under the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 is not applicable.

However, the DAC Secretary had taken advice from the Diocesan Registry that as previous informal consultation had occurred with the Church Buildings Council (CBC), received in accordance with rule 4.6(3) of the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 and provided by delegated authority under section 12(2) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018, formal consultation with that body should be undertaken, in accordance with rule 4.7, prior to the receipt of formal DAC advice.

As such, and not being in receipt of the formal consultation response of the CBC at the time of the present meeting, the Committee resolved to defer the application, for the scheme to be reconsidered for formal DAC advice at the next DAC meeting (15th September 2021).

**Decision:** Defer

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to inform the applicant

**5. Casework by Delegated Authority**

None this meeting

**6. Registry Matters**

None this meeting

## 7. Site Visits & Reports

*In relation to the [Health Protection \(Coronavirus, Restrictions\) \(Steps etc.\) \(England\) \(Revocation and Amendment\) Regulations 2021](#) (from 19th July 2021), and related Government and Church of England guidance, DAC and adviser site visits can resume, subject to individual requirements and local situations, and only in accordance with the diocesan COVID-19 [policy and procedure](#) for site visits (see item 2.1 above)*

### 7.1 Forthcoming DAC Site Visits

7.1.1 Hales, St Mary (access improvements and internal reordering) (OFS [2019-034232](#))

Date and time: To be confirmed (29th July 2021 at 2.00 pm proposed)

Attendees: To be confirmed

7.1.2 Ightfield, St John the Baptist (provision of kitchen and toilet facilities) (OFS [2020-048392](#); see also [2019-043924](#), removal of pews in nave north aisle)

Date and time: To be confirmed (a Tuesday afternoon requested by parish)

Attendees: To be confirmed

7.1.3 Willenhall, St Giles (develop back of church and improve heating) (OFS [2020-055875](#)) (see item 4.1.3 above)

Date and time: To be confirmed

Attendees: To be confirmed

**Action:** The Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with the DAC attendees and PCC representatives on the date and time of the DAC site visits (see item 9.1 below)

### 7.2 DAC Site Visit Reports for Approval

None this meeting

### 7.3 DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports for Approval

7.3.1 Gobowen, All Saints (lighting), 15th June 2021 (Brough Skingley)

**Decision:** The report was approved without amendment

**Action:** The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

7.3.2 Alton, St Peter (clock), 25th June 2021 (Robin Hutchinson) (see item 4.7.1 above)

**Decision:** The report was approved with minor amendments

**Action:** The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the report to the parish

7.3.3 Bolas Magna, St John the Baptist (heating), 30th June 2021 (Hugh Peate & John Polhill)

7.3.4 Bolas Magna, St John the Baptist (lighting), 7th July 2021 (Brough Skingley)

**Decision:** The reports were approved without amendment

**Action:** The Assistant DAC Secretary to issue the reports to the parish

### 7.4 DAC Adviser Site Visit Reports to Note

None this meeting

## 8. **Quinquennial Inspector Applications**

The following applications from PCCs, received prior to the agenda closing date for the current meeting, are to be processed in accordance with [section 7](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2020 and the [Lichfield Diocesan Scheme for the Inspection of Churches \(2020\)](#)

8.1 Tong, St Bartholomew (Grade I; CHR ref. [620548](#))

8.2 Cannock, St Luke (Grade II\*; CHR ref. [620072](#))

**Decision:** To process the applications by delegated authority, under [section 12\(1\)](#) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to liaise with a DAC architect member and to inform the applicants of the resultant advice, being that of the DAC

## 9. **Any Other Business**

9.1 Recommencement of DAC site visits (from September 2021)

The DAC Chair led a discussion regarding members' current availability for participating in DAC site visits (i.e. as a group, as distinct from visits undertaken by DAC advisers as individuals). Site visits have been able to be resumed from 12th April 2021, in relation to Step 2 of the Government roadmap out of lockdown, and most recently with the lifting of legal restrictions relating to Coronavirus (COVID-19) from 19th July 2021.

However, at the present meeting, professional members of the DAC (i.e. those in practice) particularly reported that levels of commercial work were extremely high, and that giving additional time, in a voluntary capacity, to the DAC for such matters as site visits (including sometimes extensive travel time) was proving problematic. Wider discussion indicated that patterns of work and behaviour had changed during the sequential national lockdowns, including where individuals were based (i.e. working from home), such that there had been some degree of geographical displacement of members.

As such, the DAC Chair moved that the Committee would review the frequency and capacity of DAC site visits, with the resumption of visits proposed in September 2021. It was separately noted that that DAC site visits did not customarily occur during August (in which month there is also no DAC meeting).

**Action:** The DAC Secretary to update the [site visits](#) web page of the diocesan website accordingly; the Assistant DAC Secretary to liaise with PCC representatives on the dates of proposed DAC site visits (item 7.1 above)

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday, 15th September 2021 at 2.00 pm**

to be held remotely (by written electronic means and online conferencing)  
*and/or* in the Reeve Room at St Mary's House

Giles Standing, DAC Secretary

[giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org](mailto:giles.standing@lichfield.anglican.org) 01543 622540

Helen Cook, Assistant DAC Secretary

[helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org](mailto:helen.cook@lichfield.anglican.org) 01543 622569